



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## AN INTRODUCTION TO THE ARABIC LITERATURE OF THE JEWS.

### II (*continued*).

#### 37. *Personal intercourse between Jews and Arabs.*

IN the former paragraphs we have principally taken into consideration the exterior position of the Jews, their dignity and their offices; now we shall, briefly, treat of the personal intercourse between Jewish and non-Jewish scholars, about which, indeed, I have already, in the preceding paragraph, occasionally given some notices.

The favour and the support of the nobility enabled learned men to devote themselves to science. The appreciation of their works awakens ambition, an ambiguous means, indeed, to encourage truth—but the old proverbial wisdom designates the proximity of kings as dangerous, like the fire and the ocean (*Hebr. Übersetz.*, p. 883, n. 210). The intercourse between scholars themselves is always a means of promotion, even in their polemics<sup>1</sup>.

That studies are possible without the recompense of titles or orders, Jewish literature is the best proof. The Jews soon recognized the preference of oral teaching to that of writing by the proverbial and typical phrase *מפי סופרים* *מפי ספרים*<sup>2</sup>. The intercourse between scholars of different

<sup>1</sup> "Iron is made sharp by iron" (Prov. xxvii. 17) is applied to scholars (Dukes, *Zur rabbin. Sprachkunde*, p. 3, n. 11). The emulation of the scribes (scholars) enlarges wisdom (science, *Baba batra*, f. 21).

<sup>2</sup> See my article in *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XVII, 17-19. The oldest quotation I have found since, occurs in the *Kusari* of Jehuda ha-Levi, II, 72 (p. 178 ed. 1853, where the German translation is not quite verbal); the Arabic text (ed. Hirschfeld, p. 126) has *כמא קילא*, "as it is said" (one says); the

faith in olden times is of greater importance<sup>1</sup>. Here we have especially to deal with public teachers, societies, and private relations between Jews and non-Jews. The instances I shall produce here will at once serve as sources for the knowledge of Jewish scholars among the Arabs. But I regret being obliged to begin with illustrating an invention. The oldest Jewish professor in the renowned school of Djondisabur is, according to Carmoly (*Hist. des méd.*, p. 20), Joshua ben Nun, called "Rabban de Seleucia." We wonder that as yet nobody has identified this old professor with the author of the rules for killing in a MS. of de Rossi (327<sup>22</sup>), who does not find them in the pseud-epigraphic bibliography. Indeed, we know now that these rules belong to the impostor Eldad, who on account of their difference from the Rabbinic traditions has been suspected to be a Karaïte. But could not Carmoly's

Hebrew **אמרו באשר** means commonly a sentence of the old sages; Hirschfeld's translation (1885, p. 99): "Sagt man doch: 'Aus dem Munde . . .' aber nicht: 'Aus dem Munde (!) der Bücher,'" is a double mistake, changing the quotation of a proverb into a linguistical but very unsuitable remark, when **אמרו** is translated verbally. Moreover, I found the phrase, or an allusion to it, ap. Maimonides, *Resp.*, n. 9 (rather 8), qu. 4 (n. 11, ed. Lips.), Isak Akko, introd. to the supercomm. on Nachmani (MS. Berlin, 194<sup>14</sup>, *Catal.*, Abth. 2, p. 44, n. 1); Meiri, *Bet ha-Bechira*, on Abot (ed. Wien, f. 17 b, l. 9); Isak Latif, *Rab Pealim* (*Kochbe Jizchak*, vol. XXV, f. 9, § 28); Efraim ben Gerson (1450-5), Homilies, MS. Fischl 54 (*Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XVII, 110, XIX, 30, now Brit. Mus. Or. 1307), f. 189 b; an old anonymous work on chiromancy (MS. Munich, 228<sup>4</sup> d), says: "This science is not to be learnt out of books (**מספרים**), but from the mouth of writers (authors)"; Salomo Almoli, *Oneirokritik* (f. 4, ed. Amst.), says, "from authors and books."—In my quoted article I have joined some similar sayings from Arabic sources, see also Gentius' Hebrew preface to Maimonides' דעת ה' (1640) who does not quote his source; Ethic sentences in MS. Par. 710<sup>12</sup> (קרבן על יד, Berlin, I, 70); (Honein) ap. A. Müller, *Griech. Philos.*, p. 37, and Mubaschschir, *ZDMG.*, XXXI, p. 516; Sachau, in his notes to *Alberuni*, I, 170, II, 313, does not know the sources; comp. also the Indian sentence ap. Alberuni, I, 19; Ja'akubi, p. 134, ap. Klamroth, *ZDMG.*, XLI, 417, n. 17, and Müller, *ibn abi O'seibia*, *Lesarten*, p. 8.

<sup>1</sup> At the burial of the ascetic and mystic Man'sur ibn Aradan (? 131 H. = 748-9 at Basra) Jews and Christians assisted (Hammer, III, 211).

Joshua himself be a Karaïte? Carmoly says that the details of Joshua's life are not known, but that he was the teacher of Maseweih and al-Kindi. This time Carmoly quotes his sources correctly, viz. Assemani (*Bibl. Or.*, II, 435), who distinctly says that Joshua was a Nestorian patriarch in Beth-Gabar (about 828, eighty-four years old). He was, indeed, the teacher of Maseweih, but not in medicine, and not of al-Kindi at all; his conversion is a masterpiece of the Rev. Rabbi Eljakim Carmoly.

Before passing from fiction to reality, I must mention a circumstance of importance, viz. the development of *sects* in the Orient, with which is connected proselytism combined with a relaxation of religion. Later on we shall say more about Harran (and the 'Sabians), where Synagogues were destroyed about 817-19 (Chwolsohn, *Ssabier*, I, 468). Thabit ben Korrah (833-91, Chwolsohn, I, 546 ff.), a polyhistorian, whose writings were known and translated by the Jews,—for instance, his work, *Maratib al-'Ulum* (the order or arrangement of the sciences), quoted by Moses ibn Ezra, others by Maimonides (*Guide*, II, 24),—had besides Mohammedan pupils one of Christian and one of Jewish faith, viz. JEHUDA BEN JOSEF, ibn abi 'l-Thana of Rakka (see § 20, n. 769), whom Mas'udi mentions as a philosopher and physician. The same Mas'udi, whose esteemed historical work (composed 232 H.), is now published in the original Arabic with a French translation, had met with Jews on several occasions, as, for instance, in 314 H. at Tiberias (Weil, *Khalifen*, III; *Anhang zu II*, p. xiv), and he reports about Jewish individuals and sects, for instance, about ABU KATHIR Ja'hja, &c., the teacher of Saadia Gaon, with whom he had a religious disputation in Palestine (see above, § 11, p. 626, and § 20, n. 295).

About the first half of the tenth century Hamza al-Isfahani composed his *Annales*, edited in the Arabic original by Gottwaldt, 1844, whose Latin translation followed some years later. The fifth book of this work treats especially of the chronology of the Israelites, and has been trans-

lated into German by the author of this introduction (*Frankel's Zeitschr.*, 1845, p. 271)<sup>1</sup>. Hamza designs as his own source (p. 321) the work of PINCHAS BEN BATA, which has remained unnoticed, perhaps a pseudepigraphical work attributed to Pinchas, the pretended teacher of Mohammed (*Frankel's Zeitschr.*, II, 447), or perhaps by the president of the Academy, mentioned in the Masora, in whom Pinsker (pp. 29, 32) scents a Karaïte<sup>2</sup>. At the beginning of the said chapter, Hamza remarks that at Bagdad, in the year 308 H. (920-21), he made the acquaintance of a celebrated scholar named ZIDKIJJA, who communicated to him a short synopsis of the old Jewish chronology.

The tenth century is of great importance for the history of West Asia and its religions. At that period the heterodox tendencies combined with political agitations came to the front<sup>3</sup>. After that the Christian 'Sabians, called Mandaïtes, or 'Sabians of the marshy districts (Chwolsohn, I, 738), in the south of Mesopotamia, had existed more in literature than in reality, the 'Sabians of Harran; Syrian-Hellenistic heathen, stepped forth, using (in 830) this name in order to have the benefit of the tolerated religions under Islam. Their chief residence was Harran, their scholars who developed their system lived at Bagdad (Chwolsohn, XI), where they were partly favoured by the different Khalifs up to the eleventh century (Chwolsohn, pp. 651, 669); after this time, however,

<sup>1</sup> It remained, it seems, unknown to Bacher (*Bibel, &c., in der muhammed. Lit.*, in Kobak's *Jeschurun*, VIII, 11 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> Cp. also the part of PINCHAS BEN JAÏR in later traditions according to Epstein ("Le livre des Jubilés," &c., *Rev. d. Ét. Juives*, t. 21, p. 80 t. 22, p. 1).

<sup>3</sup> On the Mohammedan sects Hammer's enumerations in the *Jahrbücher* of Vienna are more extensive than profound or exact. The well-known work of Schahrastani on religions and sects, with special regard to philosophical principles and to creeds, is translated into German with useful notes by Haarbrücker (1850-1). My article "Muhammedanische Secten" in Pierer's *Universalexicon* has been mutilated by the editors.—The Fihrist (p. 341) gives the following curious notice: "A Jew wrote for Aridi (or Ureidi), head of a sect called 'the men, who were in fear (?) of the sun,' the books of the prophets and of the sages."

they lost all importance (p. 671 ff.). The most renowned of their learned men was Thabit ben Korra (mentioned above). The Greek philosophy was studied, probably at first by less orthodox scholars, from the eighth century. The Alides, or "Imamijun," expected the return of Ali, which was already taught by Abdallah ben Saba (Weil, *Khalifen*, II, 494; *Frankel's Zeitschr.*, II, 447; *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XIV, 68), especially the Ismaelites, so called from Ismaïl ben Dja'afar al-'Siddik, probably at the time of Mohammed ben Ismail, or at his death, and later; that creed was brought into a system by Abdallah ben Maimun Kaddâh (middle of the third century H., see De Sacy, *Exposé*, I, p. clxv; Weil, II, 103, places him earlier). Under Ahmed ben Abdallah, about 274 H. (Sacy, I, p. clxvi), arose the Karmaths, so named from Hamdan ben Asch'ath, called Karmath (ib., p. clxix), who, during a whole century, stirred all Syria and Egypt<sup>1</sup>. The theory of the Mahdi brought the Fatimides to the throne, and was carried to extremes by al-'Hakim, under whom the Druses developed their abominable system. The missionary fanaticism knew well how to turn all elements and religions to its own advantage (Weil, II, 499 ff.). With respect to the law and the rites of Islam some essential abrogations took place, among others the feast of Ramadhan was transplaced, and the Kibla turned to Jerusalem. At first these alterations were founded on the interpretation called Ta'awil (opposed to Tanzil), hence they were called "Bathinijja"<sup>2</sup>. A branch of the Ismaelites were the Assassins who especially flourished in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (Weil, *Khalifen*, III, 204 ff.; De Sacy, *Exposé*, &c.; comp. notes to Benjamin of Tudela, II, p. 72). These different movements were naturally

<sup>1</sup> I have not yet been able to read an article of De Jong on the Karmaths, of which I have seen an insufficient quotation.

<sup>2</sup> باطنية is opposed to ظاهرية (a monograph on the Zahirijja has been published by Goldziher); in Hebrew the corresponding terms are פנימי and חיצוני, or נסתר and גלוי (the Imams = נשיאים, see in נסתר attributed to Simon ben Joehai, on which I have treated in *ZDMG.*, XXVIII and XXIX). Comp. also *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Jud.*, 1898, p. 169.

not without influence on the scholars and their lives. We have a characteristic anecdote told by an orthodox Spanish theologian. At the end of the tenth century he attended a public disputation of the Mutakallimun at Bagdad, where the different Mohammedan sects, also "materialists, atheists, Jews, and Christians" were represented (see the account in the *Journ. Asiat.*, reported in *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, 1861, p. 14). It is questionable whether this fact has not some connexion with a note—a very recent one, indeed—of disputations of the Gaon Hai (ob. 1039). We know at least that Hai once ordered somebody to ask the Katholikos about an exegetic question<sup>1</sup>. Such circumstances explain in some way that the Khalif Mu'atadhad, soon after ascending the throne, prohibited the booksellers from selling philosophical works, banished the narrators of tales, the astrologers and soothsayers, and (284 H.) forbade *public disputations* in matters of creed. Weil (*loc. cit.*, II, 513) wonders that under this orthodox Khalif the greatest opposition against the Khalifat took place, and regards it as a kind of nemesis against the Abbasides. But it was, perhaps, just orthodoxy which provoked the contrast. Alkadhir, too, under whom the Muatazelites were not any longer the "protestants"—but the "rationalists of Islam" (Weil, II, 72), prohibited (408 H.) public disputations. Under such circumstances an attempt was made at Basra, in the ninth century, to form a kind of secret brotherhood (like our later freemasons), called "the brethren of purity," or "pure (real) brethren" (Ikhwan al-'Safa), whose writings, in the form of an encyclopaedia, were brought to Spain, where they were read by Jews, in the eleventh or twelfth centuries, and the latest essay on the preference of men to animals was translated into Hebrew in one week, by Kalonymos ben Kalonymos (1316)<sup>2</sup>. These few rationalists

<sup>1</sup> On the mistake of the English "when" by Geiger (repeated by Grätz, with a false quotation), see my *Polem. u. apolog. Lit.*, p. 55.

<sup>2</sup> *Hebr. Übersetz.*, p. 861.—A. Müller, in his critical article, "Lautere Brüder" (in Ersch und Gruber's *Realencyklop.*, II, vol. XLII, p. 272), reduces

with ethical tendencies were the direct contrast of the Ismaelites, teaching *idealism* in opposition to materialism; the author, or the authors, of the encyclopaedia took hold of all religious elements to promote their higher tendencies. The projected brotherhood gained no great way among the Islam, and probably counted few proselytes among Jews and Christians; but if the pretended antiquity of freemasonry could be attached to any historical fact, it might be to this society.

Our notes on other personal relations between Jews and Arabs shall be very concise. We have already mentioned that ISAK ISRAELI was the teacher of ibn al-Djezzar, and that ibn 'Sâid employed Jewish astronomers. Important Spanish scholars, as ibn Aflah, were personally connected with Jews. Some members of the family of ibn Zohr (which was even taken for a Jewish one) were in personal intercourse with MAIMONIDES. We have also spoken of the relation of al-Kifti, as well as ibn O'seibia, to different Jews. According to a very dubious notice, the persecuted Averroes took refuge with the Jews at Lucena. Abu 'l-Fat'h Kamal al-Din Musa ben abu 'l-Fadhl Junis (1156-Feb. 1242) of Bagdad, a celebrated scholar in almost all sciences, was suspected by the orthodox party because of his predilection for speculative sciences, especially mathematics, and his want of rigor in religious matters. Ibn Khallikan, who knew him personally, reports in his article about Musa, that he explained to Jews and Christians the Old and the New Testament in a manner, which so persuaded them, that nobody else could do better<sup>1</sup>. A contemporary parallel in Spain is Abu Bekr Muhammed

the importance of the society itself to its real value; but he seems not to have studied the *literary* influence of the work (which Dieterici, in his paraphrases, pretends to be "the *philosophy* of the Arabs in the tenth century," but without historical truth) on the writings of later authors with various and different tendencies.

<sup>1</sup> *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XVI, 11. The printed *ibn abi O'seibia*, I, 306, has a longer article, but not our notice; Leclerc, *Hist.*, II, 144, ignores the article of ibn Khallikan altogether.



al 'Rakuthi, professor of medicine, arithmetic, and music, at Murcia, after the conquest of this town (1242), when the Christians attended his lectures as well as the Jews<sup>1</sup>.

I must not conclude this paragraph without mentioning two Jews who were employed by Christian princes on account of their knowledge of Arabic<sup>2</sup>.

38. *The nature of the Arabic language of the Jews, and some remarks of the Jews on the Arabic language.*

The Arabic which the Jews spoke and wrote has till now been the object of only a few occasional remarks. The recent editors of Jewish Arabic texts have begun to make the language of the Jews the object of special investigation. I have not been able to reduce all the specialities to general rules. I shall, therefore, restrict myself to some historical remarks.

We here take no notice of the peculiarities, which we find also in the dialect of the Arabic itself, for instance, the different pronunciation of غ, and such like, though it is possible that the Jews, in their wandering from one country to another, kept the pronunciation of their former abode, thus, for instance, the Jewish-German dialect has retained some archaisms. We must also take into consideration the *vulgar* Arabic dialect<sup>3</sup>, which offers a closer connexion with the Hebrew language by dropping the final vowel. We learn from Arabic sources that some Jewish scholars were anxious to speak a correct and even elegant Arabic; for instance, ibn abi O'seibia asserts that

<sup>1</sup> *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XIV, 67, where instead of Abulfeda read Casiri, II, 81; comp. Leclerc, *Hist.*, II, 250.

<sup>2</sup> ASTRUC Bonafoux was the Arabic secretary of Don Jaime (Jacobs, *An Inquiry into the Sources*, &c., pp. 159, 369; Kayserling, *J. Q. R.*, VIII, 495).—The physician ISAK (1294) was the secretary of the "Cartas Arabigas" (under Sanchez? *De los Rios*, *Storia* II, 61).

<sup>3</sup> For instance מַעֲרִיב and הוֹלִיב apud Moses ben Tobia (Kaufmann, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Jud.*, 1895, p. 48.—See also the general remark of Dr. Hirschfeld, in *Revue des Ét. Juives*, XXV, 261).

the physician Hibat Allah ibn D'JAMI, mentioned above, spoke a pure Arabic, and to be able to do so always had a lexicon of Djauhari at hand. Another instance has likewise been mentioned above, respecting Israel Israeli's interpreting an Arabic document (§ 22). Ewald (*Beiträge*, p. 4) asserts that in most Arabic-Jewish MSS. there are to be found some deviations from the general manners of writing and formation of words, reminding of the vulgar language. I think it would have been more exact to substitute—for the obscure expression Arabic-Jewish—"Hebrew-Arabic," because a part of those peculiarities, especially the orthography, is derived from the Hebrew *characters*, although they are not without analogy to some occurrences in copies of Mohammedan writings; for instance, the substitution of the radical letters, not only for  $\text{ך}$  and  $\text{ק}$ , but also for  $\text{ל}$ , that is the designation of the origin, which probably was in the Arabic language itself a grammatical consequence that by degrees became a prevailing rule; we find similar cases in the new-Hebrew dialect, which cannot be discussed here.

The Arabic Bible translation of SAADIA Gaon offers an independent peculiarity, which aims at assimilating the Arabic as much as possible to the Hebrew, forming some few new words, for instance,  $\text{רר}$ , plur.  $\text{ררות}$ , for Hebr.,  $\text{פר}$ ,  $\text{פרים}$ , also to be found with the Karaïtes and others (Munk, *Annalen*, III, 86; *Tanchum*, p. 105; Geiger, V, 291), as well as some forms of words which are true Arabic, but applied in an uncommon signification, which became the object of ibn Balam's criticism (see references in *Catal. Bodl.*, p. 2181 ff.)<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> On  $\text{ז}$  for  $\text{ס}$  in Magrab, see § 20, under  $\text{זלשמה}$ ; on  $\text{ז}$  for  $\text{ז}$ , see § 20, n. 161 under  $\text{זיץ}$ , comp. Geiger, *Zeitschr.* II, 299; the contrary in Syriac, see *ZDMG.*, XIX, 574. Comp. on the hissing sounds in Assyrian and Hebrew, Halévy in *Revue des Ét. Juives*, XXI, 240. In the tables of Josef ibn Wakkar, Munich MS. n. 230, there is  $\text{ח}$  and  $\text{ח}$  for  $\text{ח}$  and  $\text{ח}$ ,  $\text{ח}$  and  $\text{ח}$  for  $\text{ח}$ ;  $\text{ח}$  for  $\text{ח}$  is rare, and so is  $\text{ח}$  for  $\text{ח}$ . The peculiarities of Hebrew MSS. are not always Jewish; see, for instance, in the commentary on the Mishna of

The Hebrew grammar, as a science, was developed by means of the Arabic, and so the Hebrew metre according to the Arabic; hence it is self-evident that Hebrew grammarians diligently studied Arabic writers; ABU 'L-WALID JONA explicitly quotes such Arabic authors, and even Ewald (*Beiträge*, p. 147) cannot help testifying that Jona has exactly read them, distinctly quoting the Arabic grammarian Sibujeh or Sibaweih<sup>1</sup>. This grammarian (edited by H. Derenbourg) was very popular, and to him refers an anecdote disfigured by Jost, IX, 175. The Arabic grammarian Mazini (who lived under Wathik, and died 249 H.)<sup>2</sup> used to bear a copy of Sibaweih in his sleeve, and by this means consumed twenty copies. A learned Jew offered to Mazini the sum of a hundred pieces of gold for instruction in that book, but the latter refused the offer, pretending that the Koran forbids the instruction of the Jews. Soon afterwards Wathik offered the grammarian a thousand pieces of gold for the same service, and Mazini, accepting that offer, said: I have given God a hundred pieces and have got a thousand. Interesting is the following passage of Abu'l-Walid in his grammar (p. 129 of the Hebrew translation, the text is not at my disposition, nor the French translation): "Do not believe that I quote in this work and in others the words of the Arabs and their views in their language, to rely on them more (להתחזק בהם) than on the views of the Hebrews, but only to show to the fools and others who presume that they know, while they are void of knowledge, that what I say to be convenient in Hebrew, is also convenient in other languages<sup>3</sup>."

Maimonides, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Jud.*, 1898, p. 430. Supplements to the Arabic lexicons from Hebrew sources are pointed to by Poznański in *Zeitschr. f. Hebr. Bibliogr.*, III, 96.

<sup>1</sup> סיבוייהם, p. 151, הרקמה.

<sup>2</sup> D'Herbelot, III, 351, of the German translation; Flügel, *Grammatische Schulen*, p. 83, where می ذمی may be Christian, or Jew, or 'Sabian.

<sup>3</sup> A similar passage in Jona's lexicon, ed. Neub., p. 130, quoted by Neub. (*Notice sur la lexicographie*, p. 190), is adduced by Dukes (*Ben Chananja*, 1864, p. 476) as an excuse for Arabic quotations. In the Hebrew transla-

I add to the preceding remarks some others on the *relation between the Arabic and the Hebrew*.

The dubious commentator of the book *Jezira* (as early as the tenth century), called in a Munich MS. JAKOB ben Nissim, speaks of a work that he had begun, and where he had proved that the Hebrew is the first of all languages, having been the language of Adam, and that after the Hebrew comes the Arabic (in rank?). He has also demonstrated the relation between the two languages, exhibiting every pure word (Munk: *les mots purs*) which is to be found in Hebrew, and that the Hebrew is a pure Arabic<sup>1</sup>, and that some words in the Arabic are like some Hebrew words. He says that he has got this principle from the Danites (בני דן) who came from Palestine. This, *in abstracto*, correct view of the relation between the Hebrew, the Arabic, and the Syriac, is to be found with some of the oldest Hebrew philologists and exegetes. SAADIA, quoted by ibn Ezra in the commentary on Genesis, xxx. 37 (see Cassel's notes to *Cusari*, p. 176; Lippmann to *Safa Berura*, 2 b), explains לֹא by שְׁקָרִים, because it is so called in the Arabic language, both languages, as well as the Aramean, being of the same "family." Jehuda ibn Koreisch (*Risala*, p. 2 of the Introduction translated into German, *Litbl.*, III, 26) finds the similarity of those languages very close, the difference only consisting in similar letters. He finds the reason of it in the neighbourhood of their abode, and in the relation of the tribes: Terach and Laban were Syrians (Arameans); Ismael and Kedar were "Musta'arabs" (according to Wetzstein, denizens of the Arabs) of the time of the Babylonian confusion of languages. Abraham, Isak, and Jakob drew (מחמסבין) their Hebrew from the time of

tion, ed. Bacher, p. 89, not only the preceding passage of the Arabic poet is omitted, but also the words: "Je ne suis point admirateur [je ne m'étonne pas?] de la concordance de ces deux langues."

<sup>1</sup> *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, X, 111 (and XVII, 126), where I have corrected one of the quotations of Goldziher (*Tanchuma*, p. 18), which are also to be found hereafter, compiled originally for my lectures on the subject.

Adam<sup>1</sup>. These languages(?) were like each other before their mingling, which occurred likewise in other languages<sup>2</sup>. The Hebrew and the Arabic are related in their roots, besides the servile letters which are coined in the three languages on the same form (מטבועה עלי קואלב ואחר); Koreisch, as it seems, considers the form of the words as something conventional; similar sentences are produced by other authors<sup>3</sup>. According to Jehuda ha-Levy (*Cusari*, II, 68, p. 126, ed. Hirschfeld) Adam spoke Aramean, Abraham considered this as profane, the Hebrew as specifically (not “*vornehm*,” as Hirschf., p. 97, translates), holy; Ismael brought the Hebrew to Arabia. All three languages are similar in their nouns, grammar, flexions, and conjugations, &c. Cassel’s translation (“*Stämme, Satzbildung, und Servilbuchstaben*”) is not exact.

ABRAHAM IBN EZRA, in various of his writings<sup>4</sup>, lays down a principle that the Hebrew, the Aramaic, and the Arabic are essentially one language, and accordingly explains some difficult Hebrew words or hapaxlegomena by the Arabic, because the latter has preserved some parts which do not occur in the Hebrew sources; such explanation is dubious but possible<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The old Haggada knows a “Bet ha-Midrash” (school) of Sem.

<sup>2</sup> Wetzstein, p. 26, emends אללאת plur., which is not regarded in ed. Paris, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Menachem ben Saruk, Dunasch ibn Librat (*Teschubot*, p. 67), comp. Dukes (*Beiträge*, p. 152), Tam (*Hammagd*, 1862, pp. 109, 205, 279), Moses ibn Ezra (*al-Mu’hadhara*); Dunasch, however (*Tesch.*, p. 19, quoted by Dukes, *Litbl. d. Or.*, V, 661), remarks also that one must not (always) compare the Hebrew with the Arabic, “in the expression being near, in the meaning remote” (במבטא קרובים ובפרק זרים).

<sup>4</sup> For instance, *Safa Berura*, fol. 2, ed. Lippmann, quoted by Cassel, to *Cusari*, p. 176; see now Bacher, *Abr. ibn Ezra als Grammatiker* (1881), pp. 33-35, and about פ (פה רפה), ib., pp. 137-9, n. 6, 13, 17; to be added *Iggeret ha-Shabbat* (*Ker. Chem.*, IV, 172) where he gives the reason שמחכותה לשינוי כלשון הקדש. An index of the words explained by ibn Ezra by means of the Arabic is given by Bacher, l. c.

<sup>5</sup> At the end of the comm. on Cant. he says: “The Arabic is very near (similar) to the Hebrew, for its paradigms (בניני); the letters

Of interest is the critical remark of MAIMONIDES in his *Aphorisms* (chap. 35) on Galen's assertion (*De pulsuum*).<sup>1</sup> that the Greek is the most agreeable language, the most logical and elegant, &c., that other nations grunt like swines (whereat already Razi is wondering); the language is according to Galen, conventional, and everybody considers as best what he is used to. However, Maimonides' opinion is that the language depends upon the climate, and answers to the temperament (chraasis), &c. (here he quotes al-Farabi's work on the elements); Galen, therefore, thinks of Greek, Arabic, Persian, and Aramaic as spoken in the middle climate. Indeed, the Hebrew and the Arabic, as everybody will be convinced, are like one language, and the Aramaic is near to them (Arabic apud Casiri, I, 292). In his letter to ibn Tibbon<sup>2</sup>, Maimonides says: I wonder how one who is born between the Barbarians (שנולי בין העללים) has got such a nature (quality), and pursues the sciences, and is so expert in the Arabic language, which, indeed, is a somewhat corrupted Hebrew. This is probably the source of Prophiat Duran (*Grammar*, p. 33, end of chap. 4), who says: The Arabic is corrupted Hebrew, the proof of it being their relation with respect to flexion (נירה) and grammar. The contrary is impossible: the Hebrew being the oldest language (comp. supra, p. 307, Jehuda ha-Levi). Maimonides is very probably referred to apud Abr. GAVISON, Commentary on

א'ה', the servile letters, Nif'al, Hif'il, *status constructus* (סמיכות), have the same way in both, and so the numeration, and more than half of the (Arabic) language is as the Hebrew." To Exod. xii. 9 he repeats that the greater part of the Arabic is similar to the Hebrew, &c.; here he mentions the letters א'ה'י; he remarks almost the same to Gen. i. 1; comp. to Lev. xi. 13, Exod. xii. 43, the shorter comm. to Perik. Noah (*Ozar Nechmad*, II, 222). IMMANUEL BEN SALOMO (pref. to *Eben Bochan*, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Jud.*, 1885, p. 244) observes: "The nearer a language stands to the Hebrew, the purer it is; therefore the Arabic is pure, &c."

<sup>1</sup> I first drew the attention of readers to this passage in the *Österreich. Blätter*, &c., 1845, p. 109; the passage is given in my *Alfarabi*, p. 230.

<sup>2</sup> Resp. *Pe'er ha-Dor*, n. 143. Dukes (*Litbl. d. Or.*, IX, 655) omits the word מעט (somewhat) as in the parallel of Pr. Duran (see below). Jafe (*Hammagid*, 1862, p. 102) quotes the same passage as one of the book דור!

Proverbs v. 20, חשנה, p. 16, and quoted by Dukes (*Litbl.*, V, 515, n. 19), who says: "In truth they (the sages) said, the Arabic was (originally) Hebrew but it became corrupted." I found 1,013 words, all Arabic; some of them (מהם) where there is neither contortion nor corruption like על, יד (sic) רגל, &c., others are corrupted," &c. Jehuda MOSCONI (1362, *Magazin für d. Wissensch. d. Judenth.*, III, 195) says: "The Hebrew and the Arabic language are like two sisters, but not daughters of one *father*, for when their mother produced the Hebrew language, which is our sacred language, the daughter of the first (and?) perfect, Eber, after having been produced (שהוציאה) by Sem, and before Sem by Noah, and before Noah by Adam, her first father, she became perfide and produced the Arabic language, impure in conception and birth, &c.; in its beginning the saint language is but *corrupted*<sup>1</sup>, hence Abraham ibn Ezra often adduces the Arabic languages," &c.

Abraham Bukrat of Tunis (1507), in his printed book of a commentary on Salomo Isaki, to Genesis xxviii. 36 (*Litbl.*, IX, 302), explains also from the Arabic "which is corrupted Hebrew," quoting an Arabic sentence, where the verb in singular feminine refers to a plural masculine, besides a passage in the Mishna. Nicoll (*Catalogue*, p. 392) quotes the following passage: The Jews call the Arabic language a "corrupted Hebrew," "utpote pleraque vocabula communia habentem, sed paullulum mutata vel immutatione, vel transpositione, appositione, vel diminutione literae, mutatis et vocalibus; reliqua vocabula inquilina fere: in Dara Africae parte purissime loquuntur et Hebraicae linguae conformiter" (is the author of this passage SA'ADIA Levy Azankut?).

SERACHJA ben Isak, the Spaniard in Italy (thirteenth century), in his frequent explanations from the Arabic repeats his view of the near relation between the languages (*Hebr. Bibl.*, XII, 45). Also Caspi (to Lam. iii. 12) remarks:

<sup>1</sup> The whole comparison is forced and inconsistent.

"The Aramaic, the Hebrew, and the Arabic are of one basis or element"; but he goes so far as to derive the Arabic *ibn* from the Hebrew אבן, stone (see § 15 and § 122). The Samaritan Ibrahim, from the tribe Ja'akub, points to the excellence of the Hebrew language "to which belongs the greatest part of the Arabic" (*ZDMG.*, XII, 724)<sup>1</sup>.

### 39. *The relation between Arabic and Jewish literature.*

This relation is essential for the importance and estimation of Jewish literature, but we cannot enter here upon a special discussion thereof. I have taken it into consideration in various other lectures. Here I shall give a mere sketch of the matters which are there to be considered, without bringing them into an exact system.

I. The *interior connexion* of the Arabic language with the Hebrew in two respects, viz. philology and practice. The former belongs to the history of grammar, the latter to the history of poetry, rhetoric and theory of style, and especially to the history of the scientific style and technology. Both produce Hebrew Arabisms and imitations. The reaction against the Arabic influence created a fanaticism against the preponderance of the Arabic from various motives, and was itself, partly, the motive of Hebrew imitations out of emulation, for instance, the book *Musar*, by ISAK ibn Crispin, the *Tachkemoni* of Jehuda al-Charisi, the *Meshal ha-Kadmoni* of Isak ibn Sahula. This rivalry has a typical expression in Hagar and Sarah, the "slave" and the "mistress."

II. *Exterior influences* are of various kinds. The respective objects are, for instance, signs of *scripture* abbreviations

<sup>1</sup> Ibn al-Athir al-Djazari (ob. 637 H. = 1239-40) pretends to have met with a Jew of great authority in Egypt who avowed the Arabic to be the finest language, it being the youngest, refining that which in the older language is vicious (Goldziher, in Kobak's *Jeschurun*, IX, 25).—Sujuti calls the Aramaic "corrupted Arabic" (ib., p. 25, n. 11). The tendency of a letter of the Christian Lipomanni (15th cent.) to Isak Kohen about the Arabic conjugation (MS. Paris, 1274) is unknown.



(especially י' for ibn, § 14, p. 120), names of the various characters of writing, תעליק=כתיבה חלוייה, and such like<sup>1</sup>.

We find in a hymn of ibn Gajjath, דל באלה קדש שם (Geiger, *j. Ztschr.*, II, 305). Of אלפבית (alphabet) the syllable *al* has been taken for the Arabic article, and hence a noun פבית (Sachs, *ib.*, p. 174), in the same way as the name Alexander has with the Arabs become Iskander (*Frankel's Zeitschr.*, 1845, p. 322; Rapoport, *Erech Milin*, p. 66; similar errors of Schnurrer ap. Grätz, III, 498). The Arabic has even influenced the pronunciation of the Hebrew, for instance, that of ט and ת with Dagesh; the pronunciation of the five Hebrew vowels (see the passage of Simon Duran, *Magen Abot*, fol. 55, quoted, but corrupted, by Dukes, *Kontres ha-Masoret*, p. 38). We find the influence of the Arabic also in some geographical names (*Catal. Bodl.*, Introduction, p. xxix). In the first part of this introduction I have treated of the Arabic names of the Jews.

#### 40. Conclusion, Different branches.

In this short survey of the different branches of the Jewish-Arabic literature I intend to omit some matters, and some sources, mentioned in the former part of this introduction<sup>2</sup>. The present choice of authors and works is made with respect to three points of view. (1) Importance of the works. (2) Their preservation in the original or in translations, especially of those which have been published. (3) Writings hitherto almost unknown, but worth investigation. I do not pretend that I have separated the branches

<sup>1</sup> Several instances of this category are given by Dukes in *Litbl. d. Or.*, IV, 51, VIII, 681; comp. my *Vorlesungen über die Kunde hebr. Handschr.*, passim. Schmiedl (*Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Jud.*, 1860, p. 103, דמנשר, 1862, p. 15) advances some conjectures not based on a sufficient knowledge of Arabic.

<sup>2</sup> I have mostly omitted references to *Hebr. Übersetz.*, if the author is treated there in a special article, and also to the sources, if the matter is doubtful and needs a special investigation, which is reserved for the *Bibliotheca Judaeo-Arabica*, for instance, in the following paragraph.

here according to an exact scientific principle, I thought it sufficient for my purpose to distinguish some connected groups.

#### 41. I. *Poetry.*

The oldest and original Arabic poetry of the Jews arose in Arabia itself. Some Jewish poets, and even poetesses, lived at the time of Mohammed, for instance, SAMUEL ben Adijja; but even in *his* poetry nothing specially Jewish has hitherto been discovered<sup>1</sup>. Something similar is to be met with at the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century in the Iberic peninsula, where we find ABRAHAM IBN AL-FAKHKHAR and ABRAHAM IBN SAHL, whose poems have been recently edited twice, and the poetess KASMUNA (§ 20, n. 287; Lebrecht, *Litbl. d. Or.*, 1841, p. 248); also single verses by different authors also of the twelfth century, to which belongs also the Karaïtic plagiarist, MOSES DAR'I (§ 20, n. 150<sup>e</sup>). Besides real poetry, there are didactic rhymes of which nothing but the form is that of poetry. Of this latter kind is the psalter of CHEFEZ AL-KUTI (or al-Futi, eleventh century?), quoted by Solomon ben Gabirol, and still existent in a MS.; such are some rules for killing animals, some poems of SAMUEL HA-NAGID, in seven languages (in the form of Kasidas), an *Ardjuza* on fever (MS. Leyden, 755), JOSEF IBN HASAN'S translation of *ha-Musar* by Isak ibn Crispin, likewise in the form of Kasidas, the *Sab'inijja* of MOSES TOBI, recently edited and translated into Hebrew by Solomo ben Immanuel da Piera. JEHUDA AL-CHARISI wrote a rhymed introduction or dedication to his *Tachkemoni*, in which there is to be found a poem in different languages, edited by Barges and Kaempf.

Some Hebrew poems were also commented on in Arabic language, for instance, the *Tarschisch* of Moses ibn Ezra.

Of Arabic *hymns*, and the *liturgy* in general, we have

<sup>1</sup> See Delitzsch, *Jüd.-arab. Poesien*, &c. (above, § 4, p. 233).

already spoken above (§§ 21, 22); here we mention the most important works. The liturgy (*Siddur*) of SAADIA Gaon is only preserved in a MS. at Oxford (Neub., 1096), not acknowledged before. A special account of it is given in the *Catal. Bodl.*, p. 2203, by Neubauer in *Ben Chananja*, 1863, p. 552; 1864, pp. 199, 234, and by Zunz, *Lit.* (p. 668). It is the oldest liturgy in the Arabic language preserved, the *Siddur* of Amram Gaon being only existent in a much later Hebrew compendium. Of Saadia's work we regret the loss of the first part, which in a general and rational way treated the whole matter. Another work of that kind, by ibn al-DJASUM (end of the tenth or eleventh centuries), is only known by quotations (*Catal. Bodl.*, p. 2067). Another similar work, by SALOMO BEN NATHAN al-Sidjilmasi (twelfth century), is preserved in five MSS. of the Bodleian Library (*Kerem Chem.*, VIII). The ritual is treated by ISRAEL ISRAELI in his *מצוות ומניית* (about 1330), of which only the Hebrew translation by Schemtob Ardutial exists in MSS. at Florence, Paris, and Oxford<sup>1</sup>.

#### 42. II. *Hebrew Philology.*

The sources for Hebrew philology in general are given in my *Handbuch* (1859), to which are added *Zusätze und Berichtigungen* in the *Centralblatt für Bibliotheksw.* (1896, 1898). For our special subject, see Ewald and Dukes, *Beiträge zur Gesch. d. ältesten Auslegung* (1844); Munk, *Notices sur Aboulwalid (Extrait du Journal Asiatique)*; Neubauer, *Notice sur la lexicographie (Extrait du Journal Asiat., 1861)*; Bacher in Winter und Wünsche, *Die Jüd. Litteratur*, vol. 2, and his *Anfänge der hebr. Grammatik* in *ZDMG.*, 1897 (and separately in fifty copies)<sup>2</sup>. Recently a dis-

<sup>1</sup> On the elements of Arabic poetry in the later Hebrew see the article *בספרות ישראל* by David Yellin in the *Journal השלוח* V, 302 (April, 1899).

<sup>2</sup> The little importance of Fürst's borrowed notices in the preface to his *Hebrew Lexicon* and in the *ZDMG.*, XX, 197, has been shown by Geiger

cussion took place about the question: at what time and through whom the Hebrew philology was founded and developed. Munk and Geiger considered the Karaïtes to have been the first grammarians, because Jepheth mentions grammarians (מְדַבְּרִים); Rapoport, however, and the author of this essay (Jewish literature and *Handbuch*) deny this, and I supported my opinion by the interpolation of the Grammar of ibn Ezra, and by the want of quotations in the Grammar of Ahron ben Josef. Geiger himself detected later (*Hebr. Bibl.*, 1861, p. 43) that the pretended Karaïte, "KOHANI," was no other than Moses Gikatilia. Pinsker goes to the contrary extreme (comp. the criticism of Schorr in *he-Chaluz*, vol. VI). Harkavy, also, goes to another extreme, pretending that the Karaïtic philology exerted no influence whatever on the Rabbinical. But none of the named authors will agree with him (*Magazin f. d. W. d. J.*, XX, 236). Some old Karaïtic writings are only known by quotations, and there is no sufficient reason to suppose that the Karaïtes were the first writers on Hebrew grammar and lexicography. Abraham ibn Ezra in his *Meosnajim* mentions the oldest writers (זקני) on the Hebrew language, and of these only three works were composed in Hebrew.

The first author in this branch, as almost in all others, is SAADIA Gaon, who composed a collective work (כתב אגללה), divided into different parts with separate titles<sup>1</sup>, and a lexicon more for the purpose of practical usage in oratory and poetry, besides a compilation of about seventy or more hapaxlegomena, edited several times in Arabic and Hebrew; Geiger suggests that it is a fragment of a work against the Karaïtes.

In the tenth century, and the beginning of the eleventh,

in the *ZDMG.*, p. 436. Fürst, loc. cit., does not mention his sources, not even J. Chr. Wolfii *Historia lexicogr. hebr.*

<sup>1</sup> On this independent work and its parts, see the just remarks of Bacher on Harkavy's *Studien*, &c., vol. V, in *Revue des Ét. Juives*, XXIV, 30 (XXV, 145).

there lived some authors only known by either quotations or fragments recently discovered. We are even in doubt as to which branch of writings these fragments belong, whether to grammar, lexicography, or exegesis, nor are we sure whether these authors are Karaïtes or not. I shall restrain myself here and mention only the names without entering into a research; they are, for instance, Abu Kathir JAHJA BEN ZAKKARIJJA al-Katib of Tiberias<sup>1</sup>, who is said to have translated the Bible into Arabic; I have formerly suggested his identity with ALI BEN JEHUDA ha-Nasir and JEHUDA BEN 'ALLAN; an anonymous Karaïte wrote also in Tiberias the book מאור עינים; Abulwalid mentions JAKOB, the pilgrim (החונן), at Jerusalem; the author of the book אלמשתמל is, according to recent discoveries of Harkavy and Bacher, the Karaïte HARUN (Ahron).

The question which Rabbanite is to be mentioned first after Saadia leads into the depths of the literature of the tenth century. The points of issue in this intricate research are, the voyage of the four scholars from Bari, the author of a commentary on the book Jezira, the time of the death of Isak Israeli, the period of Eldad ha-Dani, and the respective responsum of Zemach Gaon, and that of Chisdai Schaprut. The present enumeration follows principally that of Abraham ibn Ezra whom Munk (*Notice sur Aboulwalid*, p. 60), against Rapoport's view, attributes the first authority.

Of DUNASCH (Adonim) BEN TAMIM of Kairuwan with different by-names<sup>2</sup>, ibn Ezra mentions a work "composed of Hebrew and Arabic," sacrificing clearness to a pun (מעורב מעברי וערב). Moses ibn Ezra reports (see the passage in *Catal. Bodl.*, p. 1335) that Dunasch composed a work like IBRAHIM BEN BARUN'S (§ 20, n. 94, see below). Munk attributes to him one of the commentaries on the book Jezira, where he quotes his own work on the relationship of Hebrew and Arabic (see the passage above, § 38); but

<sup>1</sup> See under the names, § 20, n. 180, 254, 295.

<sup>2</sup> אלשפני ap. Abraham ibn Ezra, המורדי and הנבלי.

if the Danites mentioned in that commentary are to be referred to Eldad, then the respondent Zemach Gaon must be Zemach ben Kafna who died 937. Grätz (V, 527) cannot conceive how we may identify abu Dani with Eldad, since it is critically confirmed (!) that Dunasch is the author of the commentary mentioned. Saadia ibn Danan reports that Dunasch embraced Islam; but Munk considers this assertion to be unfounded. For the reasons mentioned above we are not quite sure about the exact time of JEHUDA IBN KOREISCH (formerly pronounced Karisch, see § 20, n. 678), of whom we only possess the *Risala* (epistle) which recommends the comparison of languages. Goldberg accompanies the edition of the *Risala* with some little founded suggestions<sup>1</sup>. Munk identified Koreisch with abu Ibrahim "al-Dajjan" (as he supposed) quoted by Moses ibn Ezra as the author of the book *al-Muwazina* (the balance); this is, indeed, according to its description, similar to the *Risala* of Koreisch, wherein the Barbaric language is compared. The true text of Moses ibn Ezra, however, has not "al-Dajjan," but BEN BARUN (see above); the remaining part of the book *al-Muwazina* on grammar and lexicography is published by Kokofzow, unfortunately with a Russian introduction (St. Petersburg, 1893). But that Moses ibn Ezra does not mention Koreisch at all appears strange enough. Rapoport placed Koreisch even before Saadia, because of his supposed contemporariness with Eldad.

HAI GAON (ob. 1038) composed a lexicon in Arabic with the title *al-Ḥawi*, which ibn Ezra translates *ha-Meassef*, probably the same as *ha-Kemiza* apud Botarel; the latter has been suspected as an invention by Geiger<sup>2</sup>. It is not impossible, although not proved, that this lexicon

<sup>1</sup> For instance, about the quotation of (Pseudo-)Asaf (upon which Grätz's statements, *Gesch.*, V, 93, are also incorrect), where the passage is not to be found; see Geiger, *j. Ztschr.*, I, 310, Virchow's *Archiv*, XL, 55.

<sup>2</sup> Geiger, I, 314; comp. *ZDMG.*, XVIII, 681, without reference to *Catal. Bodl.*

contained also some grammatical parts. It was arranged according to the final letter, like some Arabic works; Kimchi quotes the word רצו as being put under the letter ר. Probably it contained also the explanation of some later Hebrew or Chaldaic words occurring in the Talmud. Hai has explained the words, or some of the words, in the Talmudic tractat, *Baba Bathra* in a special treatise addressed to Elchanan ben Schemarja (*Hebr. Bibl.*, 1861, p. 101; Geiger, *j. Z.*, II, 313); his commentary on the *Seder Tohorot* is principally an exposition of difficult words, and not abridged, as Reifmann supposed, because such a commentary of single words seemed to that Talmudist a strange thing.

Although by this time the Hebrew language was used in the lexicon of Menachem ibn Saruk, and its criticism by Dunasch ibn Labrat of Fez, yet the use of the Arabic language in Hebrew philology remained prevalent. JEHUDA 'HAJJUDJ (Chajug) founded in the eleventh century the theory of the weak letters. His works have been published partly in the original language in 1898, after the publication of a Hebrew translation by MOSES IBN GIKATILLA<sup>1</sup> with additions, edited by Nutt<sup>2</sup> (1870), and of a simple translation by Abraham ibn Ezra without sufficient correctness, edited by Dukes in his *Beiträge*, &c. (1844).

Whether some scholars, mentioned by Jona, as ISAK GIKATILLA, ISAK LEVI ben Saul, and ISAK IBN SAHL, wrote certain works is doubtful, and the hypotheses advanced by Fürst (preface, p. 561), founded on sources not mentioned, are not worth refutation. ISAK IBN SAUL is mentioned in a Karaïtic source (Pinsker, p. 65) as the author of a lexicon (אגרון); but this notice is suspected. Fürst quotes Moses ibn Ezra according to a passage apud Wolf, III, p. 4; but there is no mention of a lexicon (Dukes, *Beiträge*, p. 165; *Nachal*, p. 9; Munk, *Notice*, p. 78).

<sup>1</sup> The additions are not later extracts from Kimchi; see Poznański in *Stade's Zeitschr. f. A. T. W.*, 1895, p. 133, against Peritz and Bacher.

<sup>2</sup> See the article of Egers in *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XI, 18.

A science of Hebrew grammar was established by ABULWALID MERWAN (JONA) IBN DJANA'H, called "the winged" (בעל הכנפים, § 20, n. 127), who composed a remarkable work, divided into two parts: (1) *al-Lum'*, edited by J. Derenbourg (1880), of which there is a French translation by Metzger (1889), a Hebrew translation by Jehuda ibn Tibbon (הרקמה), ed. by B. Goldberg, with notes by R. Kirchheim (1856); the introduction is already given in Arabic and French by Munk in the *Journ. Asiat.*, 1850-51, and the German translation of the French by Fürst in the *Literaturbl. d. Orients* of the same year; (2) a lexicon edited by Neubauer (1875), a Hebrew translation by one Obadja, edited by Bacher (finished 1897). But there existed other translations, and the Hebrew lexicon of Salomo ibn Parchon (1161) is to be considered one of them; it is very badly edited by S. G. Stern (Pressburg, 1844). Jona wrote several single treatises on philology, ed. by H. and J. Derenbourg (1886); some notices upon these tracts were given by Ewald (*Beiträge*, 1844). Jona divides more strictly the grammatical researches from the lexicographical ones. He develops the theory of the weak letters with greater consistency; he offers some subtle linguistic remarks which may still be of some use, for instance, on the adverbial םַֿֿֿ (see Munk, *loc. cit.*, against Ewald); indeed, he sometimes transgresses the proper territory of the grammar, and some parts of his grammar contain matters which later authors entirely removed from their works. Jona is the principal source of the Karaïte Ahron ben Josef.

Of the contemporary and immediately following grammarians who went from Toledo to Cordova, and who wrote their works in Arabic, very little has been preserved, for instance from the book *al-Istignâ* (Hebrew העישר) by Samuel ha-Nagid, who, according to a passage in ibn Ezra's *Jesod Mora* (this passage is wanting in ed. Prag.), composed twenty-two grammatical treatises. No more is known of the הצרופים ס' of ISAK IBN JASOS or Jaschusch, or in Arabic ibn Sakatar or Kastar (ob. 1057), who was supposed to



be the author called המהביל (Jer. xxiii. 16) by ibn Ezra; but this designation seems to be applied to different authors (*Jewish Literature*, p. 322, n. 15; *Catal. Bodl.*, p. 2186). Nothing remained of the book of "the Kings" of DAVID IBN HADJAR of Granada (see § 20, n. 155), or of the book on "masculines and feminines" by MOSES IBN GIKATILLA, or of the "Key" of ABU 'L-FIHM LEVY IBN AL TABBÂN<sup>1</sup>. An exception is to be made with JEHUDA IBN BAL'AM, some of whose essays have been preserved in Hebrew translations, viz. those on denominatives (not perfectly preserved), edited by G. S. Polak in *ha-Karmel*, III, 213, 229 (1862), and by Adelman in Paris (quoted by Derenbourg, *Gloses*, p. 4); on particles, by S. Fuchs in *ha-Choker* (1892-4), not finished. A discussion of the various opinions about his unedited הורית הקורא would be here out of place; I have formerly identified (*Catal. Bodl.*, p. 1295) the כתאב אללארשאד, quoted by Moses ibn Ezra, and I am not yet persuaded of the absolute difference; the treatise on the poetical accents has been re-edited by Polak (1859).

By Abraham ibn Ezra and David Kimchi the Arabic language was supplanted in philology by the Hebrew. But we find in the Orient TANCHUM JERUSCHALMI, who introduced his exegetical writings by a general philological dissertation (אציל אללגה), and composed a lexicon, *Murschid*, a full edition of which has been prepared by Dr. Neubauer. The lexicon of DAVID BEN ELIA KOHEN of Seville in a MS. of the Escorial (1386, *Hebr. Bibl.*, XI, 135) requires, and merits, a special investigation. Not before the end of the fifteenth century SAADIA IBN DANAN composed a lexicon existent in a MS. of the Bodleian Library. The Karaïtes, too, did not fail to write lexicographical works, as DAVID BEN ABRAHAM al-Fasi, whom Neubauer would identify with

<sup>1</sup> Tabbên (ap. Grätz, VI, 131, who borrowed the blame from Kaempfer, see *Ben Chananya*, 1862, p. 24) is the Spanish pronunciation of the Arabic *a*.

Abraham ha-Babli, whom Geiger<sup>1</sup> does not believe to be a Karaïte at all; a compendium of David's works was compiled by abu Said LEVI, another by ALI BEN SULEIMAN, who, according to Schorr (*he-Chaluz*, VI) is not a Karaïte. The *anonymous* Hebrew-Arabic Lexicon in MS. Pocock 51 is ascribed by Uri, n. 48c, to the owner, Isak ben ha-Dajjan (see my *Conspectus*, p. 19; Neub., n. 1510).

M. STEINSCHNEIDER.

<sup>1</sup> *J. Zeitschr.*, III, 240; to Bacher's quotations in Winter und Wuensche, II, 181, 232, are to be added: Kobak's *Jeschurun*, V, 163; Gurland in *Hammagid*, IX, n. 7.

(*To be continued.*)